EXHIBIT 7

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor Tel 202.261.1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-3307 Fax 202.887.0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
ATTORNEYS

DID: (202) 261-1030
Email: sbenson@mdslaw.com
www.mdslaw.com

January 22, 2008

BY EMAIL
Girard R. Visconti, Esq.
Visconti & Boren Ltd.
55 Dorrance Street
Providence, RI 09203

Re: Consorzio v. Daniele, Inc.

Dear Gerry:

This is in response to Defendant Daniele, Inc.'s Objections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories and its Objections to Plaintiff's Request for Production.

The responses to our first set of interrogatories and first requests for document production were due January 12, 2008. With a few exceptions, you have provided no responses and only objections. In your letter of January 9, 2008, you say that you will not respond to the requests for which you have no objections pending a ruling on your motion. Your stated reason is that it will be wasteful to produce responses the Court might rule are not required at this stage.

We frankly do not understand why you propose not to respond to requests to which you have no objection. If you have no objection, on what basis are you refusing to respond? This will only delay discovery. Your email of January 22 to Mike Selter is not clear as to whether you will produce now the documents and information to which you have no objection. We expect that you will do so.

You object to some requests based on confidentiality and trade secrets. We have sent you a draft protective order for execution by the parties, which will resolve this objection and allow the parties to provide confidential documents and information. It is the same as the protective order used in the last case, with the exception of new paragraphs 14 and 15, which we understand are necessary under the revised Local Rules. We understand that you will provide us with any comments about the draft this week.

For all documents for which you have claimed privilege, please provide the information requested in the Definitions and Instructions of our first request for documents, paragraph D. See Fed. Rules Civ. Proc. § 26(b)(5)(A).

Please also note that our request for documents includes all electronically produced or stored documents. These include, but are not limited to, emails and computer files.

Our responses to your specific objections are as follows

Interrogatory No. 5:

This interrogatory includes any advice received from non-attorneys, such as marketing or branding people. Such advice is not subject to privilege.

Interrogatory No. 6:

This interrogatory asked you to identify the facts and documents which you contend show that GRAN PREMIO, etc. are trademarks. The attorney-client privilege applies only to communications with attorneys and does not protect facts or information. The privilege does not allow a party to withhold facts and arguments which it intends to use to support its contentions in this action. Therefore, the objection is not a basis for withholding the information requested. We will object to the use by you of any facts or documents that are responsive to this interrogatory and are not produced.

Interrogatory No. 7:

This interrogatory asked you to identify the facts and documents which you contend support your interpretation of paragraph 5 of the Settlement Agreement. The attorney-client privilege applies only to communications with attorneys and does not protect facts or information. Neither the attorney-client privilege nor the work-product doctrine allows a party to withhold facts and arguments which it intends to use to support its contentions in the case. Therefore, the objection is not a basis for withholding the information requested. We will object to the use by you of any facts or documents that are responsive to this interrogatory and are not produced.

Interrogatory No. 11:

In this action, Defendant contends that it is using separate trademarks for separate prosciutto products. To assess this contention, Plaintiff needs to know what products the alleged marks are used on, whether they are in fact marketed and sold commercially, and to what extent each product has been marketed and sold commercially. The relevance of Defendant's recent sales of these products is not limited to sales after the Settlement Agreement. The request for sales figures from 2000 to the present is not overly broad or burdensome. This is basic information, which is in Defendant's possession and which Defendant should be able to retrieve with no significant effort.

Interrogatory No. 13:

In this action, Defendant contends that it is using separate trademarks for separate prosciutto products. To assess this contention, Plaintiff needs to know what products the alleged marks are used on, whether they are in fact marketed and sold commercially, and to what extent each product has been marketed and sold commercially. The relevance of Defendant's recent promotion expenses for these products is not limited to promotion efforts after the Settlement Agreement. The request for promotion expenses from 2000 to the present is not overly broad or burdensome. This is basic information, which is in Defendant's possession and which Defendant should be able to retrieve with no significant effort.

Interrogatory No. 20:

This interrogatory asked for the names of persons responsible for Defendant's compliance with the Settlement Agreement and the responsibilities of each in this regard. The attorney-client privilege applies only to communications with attorneys and does not protect facts or information. The requested information would not be protected merely because it was included in a communication with an attorney.

Document Request No. 3:

Orders for Defendant's prosciutto products are relevant to the question of how, and to what extent, Defendant's alleged trademarks are being used in connection with the promotion, order, shipment and sale of the goods on which they are alleged to be used.

Document Request No. 4:

Invoices and shipping documents for Defendant's prosciutto products are relevant to the question of how, and to what extent, Defendant's alleged trademarks are being used in connection with the promotion, order, shipment and sale of the goods on which they are alleged to be used.

Document Request No. 5:

Information as such is not protected by the attorney-client privilege. The request is not overly broad or burdensome. It seeks only documents in which the alleged marks are referred to or described as trademarks or are discussed as a possible trademark.

Document Request No. 6:

Documents are not privileged merely because they contain information contained in other, privileged documents. Any documents that do not qualify for the privilege must be produced. This document request would encompass, for example, any communication between Defendant and the Consorzio or any other person or party not an attorney for

Defendant, and which Defendant contends supports its position with respect to the meaning of paragraph 5 of the Settlement Agreement. We will object to the use by you of any documents that are responsive to this request and are not produced.

Document Request No. 7:

This request seeks communications by or with Defendant during the period leading up to the Settlement Agreement of March 2005. Such communications are relevant to the interpretation of that agreement.

Document Request No. 9:

Defendant claims that the cited designations are trademarks and are not merely descriptive of the goods. Documents containing or reflecting specifications for, or qualities or characteristics of, those goods are relevant to determine the merits of this contention. Plaintiff in this request limited the period of time to the time after the August 2003 Settlement Agreement precisely in order not to impose an undue burden on Defendant. There is no reason or basis to limit such request to documents dated after the March 2005 Settlement Agreement. For example, it would be potentially relevant if Defendant made changes in its products or its specifications for products after the 2005 Settlement Agreement; such changes would not be reflected if the request were limited to documents subsequent to that date.

Document Request No. 14:

The brochures of 1998 and 2004 were important factors in the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement. They are relevant to Defendant's intentions with respect to San Daniele, which in turn are relevant to the purpose of, and proper interpretation of, the March 2005 Settlement Agreement.

Document Request No. 15:

Defendant's promotional and advertising materials, such as labels, brochures and web pages, in the period leading up to and after the Settlement Agreement of 2005 are relevant to determine whether the names now alleged to be trademarks have been used by Defendant as product descriptions. They are also relevant to determine what if any changes Defendant made to comply with the agreement. Defendant does not indicate why the response would be burdensome. Indeed, Defendant has indicated that it does not use much in the way of promotional or advertising materials. Plaintiff in this request limited the period of time to the time after the August 2003 Settlement Agreement precisely in order not to impose an undue burden on Defendant.

Document Request No. 16:

This request seeks, in part, any documents generated by or for Defendant concerning compliance with the Settlement Agreement. This would include, for example, any memoranda prepared by Defendant or its employees, discussing whether or how to comply with the agreement. With respect to documents concerning the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement, including drafts of the agreement, Plaintiff knows of no reason why this would require an order from the court. Such documents should be produced.

Document Request No. 17:

Defendant's correspondence with its purchasers and resellers while the 2005 Settlement Agreement was being negotiated, and after the agreement was executed, are relevant to determining whether and how Defendant made changes to comply with the agreement. Such correspondence is also relevant to determining whether the names claimed to be trademarks were previously used by Defendant as product descriptions. Plaintiff in this request limited the period of time to the time after the August 2003 Settlement Agreement precisely in order not to impose an undue burden on Defendant.

Document Request No. 18:

This request covers communications with non-attorneys, as well. It is not overly broad, since it covers the period in which the 2005 Settlement Agreement was negotiated.

Document Request No. 19:

This request seeks correspondence and other documents concerning websites on which Defendant's prosciutto products were described as "Daniele Prosciutto." If Defendant requested or acquiesced in such use of its name, it would have been in breach of the Settlement Agreement. In addition, Plaintiff through its counsel has requested that Defendant seek to eliminate these uses of "Daniele" as a trademark on Defendant's prosciutto, and Defendant is obligated under the Settlement Agreement to cooperate. The existence and content of any communications between Defendant and any of the owners or operators of these websites are therefore relevant. Defendant does not indicate why the response would be burdensome, unless it is suggesting that there is extensive material that would be responsive to this request. If so, Plaintiff's counsel can review it on site.

Document Request No. 20:

This request includes the period in which the March 2005 Settlement Agreement was negotiated and therefore is relevant.

Document Request No. 21:

The negotiation of the Settlement Agreement of August 2003 is relevant to the interpretation of the March 2005 agreement. Defendant itself has cited Plaintiff's draft of the August 2003 agreement in its argument in connection with the cross motions for summary judgment, claiming it was relevant to the interpretation of the 2005 agreement.

Document Request No. 23:

Defendant is claiming that these names are trademarks. Plaintiff is entitled to know if, and to what extent, they have been promoted as trademarks. Plaintiff will, for now, accept responsive documents dating from August 1, 2003.

Document Request No. 24:

Plaintiff incorporates by reference its response to Defendant's objections to Interrogatory No. 11.

Document Request No. 26:

Plaintiff claims that Defendant is seeking to retain "Daniele" as its trademark for prosciutto. Any market research concerning this mark is relevant to this claim.

Document Request No. 29:

This request seeks only copies of orders by Defendant for the printing or design of labels and packages. Plaintiff agrees to limit this request to orders concerning prosciutto products after June 30, 2005. Such documents must include any orders for labels or packages bearing the "Daniele" name; such requests after June 30, 2005 would be in breach of the agreement and would be relevant for this reason. If it would be burdensome to supply documents responsive to this request, Plaintiff's counsel can review them on site.

Document Request No. 30:

Plaintiff incorporates by reference its response to the objection to Document Request No. 29. Request No. 30 merely requests any correspondence in connection with such orders for labels or packages.

Document Request No. 38:

Prices of Defendant's prosciutto products are relevant to the question whether its alleged trademarks are grade or type designations or are otherwise descriptive of the goods on which they are used, and are therefore relevant to Counts I, II and III of the

Complaint. Defendant itself cited its range of prices for prosciutto products in support of its cross motion for summary judgment.

Document Request No. 39:

Defendant claims that these names are valid trademarks. Plaintiff in this request is merely asking for documents generated or received in the process of adopting or designing these alleged marks. Any such documents are potentially relevant. Defendant does not suggest that there are many of such documents. If production would be burdensome, Plaintiff's counsel can review them on site.

Document Request No. 42:

Plaintiff is willing to limit this request to the period March 31, 2005 and after. Defendant's changes to its Web site and the dates thereof are relevant to the question whether and when it complied with the Settlement Agreement with respect to its Web site.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Stuart E. Benson

cc: Matthew F. Medeiros, Esq.